



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,644	03/29/2004	Kelly Rollin	302801.01/MFCP.144814	4949
45809	7590	03/05/2009	EXAMINER	
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. (c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613			ORR, HENRY W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/05/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,644	ROLLIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry Orr	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 43,48-60 and 62-77 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 43, 48-60 and 62-77 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 1/21/2009.
2. Claims 43, 48-60 and 62-77 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 44-47, 61 and 78 are cancelled.
4. Claims 43, 60, 72 and 74 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/21/2009 has been entered.

Applicant's Response

5. In Applicant's response dated 1/21/2009, applicant has amended the following:
 - a) Claims 43, 49, 58, 60, 68, 72 and 74

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 9/18/2008 are withdrawn:

- a) 35 U.S.C. 112 1st Rejection to Claim 44 due to cancellation

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 74-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 74-77:

In summary, Claim 74 recites a “*computer-readable media*” comprising “*computer-readable instructions*” **EMBODIED** on the “*media*” that perform various functions. Thus, the invention recited in Claim 74 includes the “communication” medium discussed in the Specification (see Page 7, Lines 14-17) and the “wireless” medium discussed in the Specification (see Page 8, Lines 1-2).

This directly contrasts the invention recited in Claim 72 (i.e., a “*computer-readable medium* **STORING** executable computer-readable components”), which necessarily includes a computer hardware component (see Specification -- Page 5, Lines 12-22). Thus, the recited “*computer-readable media*” of Claim 74 is not a process, a machine, a manufacture or a composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claim 74 fails to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 75-77 do not further define the recited “*computer-readable media*” as being within a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Accordingly, Claims 75-77 fail to recite statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. **Claims 60 and 62-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

Claim 60:

Claim 60 recites: "A system for accessing and manipulating device information for devices installed on a computing device". (emphasis added)

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

Claim 72:

Claim 72 recites: “control bar comprising **a plurality of mechanisms for manipulating devices**”. (emphasis added)

Examiner further notes that the specification supports “control bar comprising a plurality of mechanisms for manipulating information about the devices” (see p. 14 lines 6-7). However, manipulating the devices directly is not supported.

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claim.

For examination purposes, Examiner will assume claim 60 recites “manipulating information about the devices”.

Claims 62-71 and 73:

Dependent claims 62-71 and 73 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 43, 48-60 and 62-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boldt et al. (hereinafter “Boldt”), U.S. Patent No. 6,349,304 B1, in view of Strittmatter et al. (hereinafter “Strittmatter”), U.S. Published Application No. 2004/0176118 A1 of record, in further view of Chiloyan et al. (hereinafter “Chiloyan”), U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0083228 of record.**

Claim 43:

Boldt teaches **a method for device selection in a computer system** (see col. 2 lines 5-10), **the method comprising: creating a common dialog object suitable for displaying information associated with devices installed on the computer system to a user on a display device** (see abstract, col. 2 lines 5-10, Figures 1-2).

Examiner notes that the instant specification recites "In one embodiment, the common file dialog 520 is similar to that used in the known Windows.RTM. operating system." (see p. 13 lines 15-20). Therefore, it appears that the common file dialog is a feature known in the art at the time of the claimed invention.

Boldt teaches **wherein said creating comprises leveraging at least one file management tool within the computer system** (see col. 6 lines 20-50- dialog serves

as leveraged file management tool for printer files because a user can create and transfer the printer file with the dialog).

Boldt fails to expressly teach a user-selected filter with the common file dialog object.

However, Strittmatter teaches associating a user-selected filter with a software dialog object (see par. 80-81, par. 83).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the common file dialog object as taught by Boldt to include a user-selected filter as taught by Strittmatter to provide the benefit of allowing more control to the user when choosing the desired printer device (**claim 43; associating a user-selected filter with common file dialog object;**).

Boldt fails to expressly teach obtaining device information from a function discovery database.

However, Strittmatter teaches **obtaining device information corresponding to the devices installed on the computer system to be displayed by accessing device information contained in a function discovery database** (see par. 55-56, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 5; ref. #505).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage area as taught by Boldt to include a function

discovery database as taught by Strittmatter to provide the benefit of keeping track of device information.

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to teach wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder.

However, Chiloyan teaches wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder to enumerate a list of the installed devices, the hardware and devices folder being different from the created common file dialog object; (see par. 53). **(claim 43; i.e., wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder to enumerate a list of the installed devices, the hardware and devices folder being different from the created common file dialog object;)** Examiner notes that Applicant admits that the Device Manager is synonymous with the claimed hardware and devices folder (see Response; p. 18 1st full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include a device manager as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing the properties of all the connected devices.

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **filtering the device information using the user-selected filter to obtain a filtered subset of enumerated devices** (see Strittmatter; par. 87, par. 92).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **causing the common file dialog object to output display information of the filtered subset of enumerated devices to the display device** (see Strittmatter; par. 92).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **the display information comprising an icon representation of a device in the filtered subset and a corresponding textual description of the device** (see Strittmatter; par. 96-98, Figure 15, Figure 14- teaches icons with textual descriptive titles (e.g. "pda", "BPP Printer", "LAN Printer")).

Boldt teaches **receiving a user selection of a device** (see col. 6 lines 20-50).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **returning a reference to the selected device** (see Strittmatter; par. 37, par. 56-58).

Claim 48:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **accessing the device information contained in the function discovery database comprises using a programming interface** (see Strittmatter; par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Claim 49:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein using a programming interface comprises: creating information for a first segment of code, the information received from the common file dialog object; and communicating the information for the first segment of code to a second segment of code in the function**

discovery database to access functionality provided by the second segment of code (see Strittmatter; par. 32, par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Claim 50:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises communicating through a medium** (see Strittmatter; par. 1).

Claim 51:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises dividing the communication into multiple discrete communications** (see Strittmatter; par. 26, par. 28).

Claim 52:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein the multiple discrete communications are divided into divisible sets of functionality** (see Strittmatter; par. 29, par. 40).

Claim 53:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises redefining**

the communication by ignoring at least one or more parameters (see Strittmatter; par. 65, par. 75, par. 80).

Claim 54:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises using one or more pieces of middleware to convert the communications of the first code segment to a second code segment** (see Strittmatter; par. 34-37).

Claim 55:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein communicating the information for the first segment of code to the second segment of code comprises rewriting functionality** (see Strittmatter; par. 79, par. 94, par. 98-99).

Claim 56:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein each segment of code includes at least one of a module, object, subroutine, and function** (see Strittmatter; par. 29).

Claim 57:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein each segment of code includes at least one of a source code, intermediate code, or object code** (see Strittmatter; par. 29, par. 40, par. 50 par. 104.)

Claims 58 and 59:

Regarding claims 58 and 59, both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to expressly teach determining whether an actionable function on a device within a user interface has been selected includes determining that a right-click has been performed.

However, Chiloyan teaches “The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device” (see par. 53). **(claim 58; i.e., wherein receiving a user selection of a device from the displayed common file dialog object comprises determining whether an actionable function on a device within a user interface has been selected) (claim 59; i.e., wherein determining whether an actionable function on a device within a user interface has been selected includes determining that a right-click has been performed.)** Examiner interprets pointing device that the user uses to click the chosen device as right-clicked actionable because in Windows 2000 the right mouse button lets you view the properties of a file, folder or other object.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the common file dialog as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include an actionable function for displaying properties as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device.

Claim 60:

Boldt teaches **a system for accessing and manipulating device information for devices installed on a computing device, wherein the device information is presented in a unified way, the system comprising a set of available installed devices, wherein each of the set of available installed devices is connected to the computing device** (see abstract, Figures 1 and 2).

Boldt in view Strittmatter teaches a device selection user interface displaying icons and a textual description for the set of devices (see Strittmatter; par. 96-98, Figure 15, Figure 14- teaches icons with textual descriptive titles (e.g. "pda", "BPP Printer", "LAN Printer").

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to expressly teach a device selection user interface displaying **actionable icons**.

However, Chiloyan teaches "*The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device*" (see par. 53). (**claim 60; i.e., a device selection user interface displaying actionable icons for the set of devices**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the common file dialog as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include an actionable function for displaying properties as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device. (**claim 60; i.e., a device selection user interface displaying actionable icons and a textual description for the set of devices**)

Boldt fails to expressly teach obtaining device information from a function discovery database.

However, Strittmatter teaches **a function discovery database having enumerated device information corresponding to the set of available installed devices** (see par. 55-56, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 5; ref. #505).

Strittmatter further teaches **a programming interface corresponding to the device selection user interface for interacting with the function discovery database** (see par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage area as taught by Boldt to include a function discovery database as taught by Strittmatter to provide the benefit of keeping track of device information.

Boldt fails to expressly teach a filtering component with the common file dialog object.

However, Strittmatter teaches **a filtering component for selecting a subset of available enumerated devices having a plurality of user-selectable filters and an executable component, which, when executed, filters device information using a user-selected filter to obtain a filtered subset of available enumerated devices** (see par. 80-81, par. 87, par. 92, Figure 3; ref. #315).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the common file dialog object as taught by Boldt to include a user-selected filter as taught by Strittmatter to provide the benefit of allowing more control to the user when choosing the desired printer device.

Boldt teaches a common dialog object on the user interface (see abstract, col. 2 lines 5-10, Figures 1-2).

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to expressly teach a common dialog object on the user interface having actionable icons for the set of devices.

However, Chiloyan teaches a device manager with actionable icons for a set of peripheral devices (see par. 53). (**claim 60; i.e., a data processing component having an executable component, which, when executed: creates a common file dialog object on the user interface having actionable icons for the set of devices**)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the common dialog object on the user interface as taught by Strittmatter to include actionable icons as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device.

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **associates a user-selected filter with the common file dialog object** (see Strittmatter par. 80-81).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **obtains a filtered subset of available enumerated devices to be displayed within the common file dialog object by**

accessing device information contained in the function discovery database through the programming interface and the filtering component (see Strittmatter; par. 32 par. 70, par. 91-92, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to teach wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder.

However, Chiloyan teaches wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder to enumerate a list of the installed devices, the hardware and devices folder being different from the created common file dialog object; (see par. 53). **(claim 60; i.e., wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder to enumerate a list of the installed devices, the hardware and devices folder being different from the created common file dialog object;)** Examiner notes that Applicant admits that the Device Manager is synonymous with the claimed hardware and devices folder (see Response; p. 18 1st full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include a device manager as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing the properties of all the connected devices.

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **causes the common dialog object to output display information of the filtered subset of enumerated devices to a display device, the display information comprising the icon of a device in the**

filtered subset and the corresponding textual description of the device; (see Strittmatter; par. 37, par. 56-58, par. 80-83, par. 91-98, Figure 14).

Boldt teaches **receives a user selection of a device from the displayed common dialog object;** (see col. 6 lines 20-50).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **returns a reference to the selected device** (see Strittmatter; par. 37, par. 56-58).

Claims 62 and 63:

Regarding claims 62 and 63, Both Boldt and Strittmatter fails to expressly teach actionable function icons having a click option such as a right-click option for displaying device information.

However, Chiloyan teaches “*The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device*” (see par. 53). (**claim 62; i.e., wherein the actionable icons for the set of devices have a click option for displaying device information**) (**claim 63; i.e., wherein the actionable icons for the set of devices have a right-click option for displaying device information**) Examiner interprets pointing device that the user uses to click the chosen device as right-clicked actionable because in Windows 2000 the right mouse button lets you view the properties of a file, folder or other object.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the filtered list as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include actionable icons with click options as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device.

Claim 64:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein the device selection user interface includes descriptions of the set of devices** (see Strittmatter; Figure 14).

Claims 65-67:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches a device selection user interface for wireless devices (see Strittmatter; Figure 14).

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to expressly teach a device selection user interface that has actionable buttons for wireless peripheral devices such as a mouse or keyboard.

Both Boldt and Strittmatter also fail to expressly teach a device selection user interface that has a control bar.

However, Chiloyan teaches a device manager with actionable icons representing wireless peripheral devices such a pointing device (“mouse”) or keyboard and tabs (“control bar”) to display various pages of properties pertaining to the devices. (**claim 65; wherein the device selection user interface has an actionable button for a mouse.) (claim 66; i.e., wherein the device selection user interface has an**

actionable button for a keyboard.) (claim 67; i.e., wherein the device selection user interface has a control bar.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wireless devices displayed as taught by Strittmatter to include actionable icons representing wireless peripheral devices as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the wireless devices (see Chiloyan; par.30-32, par. 36, par. 53).

Claim 68:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein the programming interface corresponding to the device selection user interface for interacting with the function discovery database comprises: a first code segment on the common file dialog object; and a second code segment on the function discovery database; wherein, when executed, the data processing component having the executable component communicates information through the first code segment to the second code segment** (see Strittmatter; par. 32 par. 70, Figure 1; ref. #115).

Claim 69:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein the information being communicated through the first code segment to the second code segment is separated into multiple discrete communications** (see Strittmatter; par. 26, par. 28).

Claim 70:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **wherein the multiple discrete communications are divided into divisible sets of functionality** (see Strittmatter; par. 29, par. 40).

Claim 71:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **comprising one or more pieces of middleware to convert the information being communicated through the first code segment to the second code segment** (see Strittmatter; par. 34-37).

Claim 72:

Boldt teaches **a computer-readable medium storing executable computer-readable components for presenting information corresponding to devices connected to a personal computer in a unified and consistent way and for accessing and manipulating device information for one or more of said devices upon being selected by a user, the executable computer-readable components, comprising:** (see abstract, col. 2 lines 5-10, Figures 1-4).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches a device selection user interface component adapted to display icons and a textual description for a set of connected devices (see Strittmatter; Figure 14).

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to expressly teach a device selection user interface that has actionable icons.

However, Chiloyan teaches “The user clicks on an icon representing the desired peripheral device at a step 172 and selects an option to view the properties of that peripheral device” (see par. 53). Examiner interprets pointing device that the user uses to click the chosen device as right-clicked actionable because in Windows 2000 the right mouse button lets you view the properties of a file, folder or other object.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the filtered list as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include actionable icons with click options as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device.

(claim 72; i.e., a device selection user interface component adapted to display actionable icon components and a textual description for a set of connected devices)

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to expressly teach the device selection user interface displaying a control bar.

However, Chiloyan teaches a device manager displaying tabs (i.e., “control bar”) to display various pages of properties (i.e., manipulating information about devices) pertaining to the devices. **(claim 72; i.e., where the device selection user interface component is further adapted to display a control bar comprising a plurality of mechanisms for manipulating devices;)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the devices displayed in the filtered list as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include actionable icons with click options and tabs as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing additional details or attributes of the device in an organized way.

Boldt fails to expressly interacting with a function discovery database.

However, Strittmatter teaches a device selection user interface component for interacting with a function discovery database, the function discovery database having enumerated device information corresponding to a set of available devices connected to the computer system (see par. 55-56, par. 80, par. 83, Figure 5; ref. #505).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the storage area as taught by Boldt to include a function discovery database as taught by Strittmatter to provide the benefit of keeping track of device information. **(claim 72; i.e., a programming interface component corresponding to the device selection user interface component for interacting with a function discovery database, the function discovery database having enumerated device information corresponding to a set of available devices connected to the personal computer;)**

Boldt Figures 2-7 illustrates **a data processing component having an executable component configured to be executed in response to a function call**

from an application, which, when executed: creates a common file dialog object on the user interface component.

Boldt/Strittmatter/Chiloyan teaches **user interface component having actionable icon components for the set of devices by leveraging at least one mechanism associated with a file management tool within the personal computer;** (see Boldt; col. 6 lines 20-50- dialog serves as leveraged file management tool for printer files because a user can create and transfer the printer file with the dialog).

Boldt fails to expressly teach a user-selected filter with the common file dialog object.

However, Strittmatter teaches associating a user-selected filter with a software dialog object (see par. 80-81, par. 83).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the common file dialog object as taught by Boldt to include a user-selected filter as taught by Strittmatter to provide the benefit of allowing more control to the user when choosing the desired printer device. (**claim 72; i.e., associates a user-selected filter with the common file dialog object;**)

Boldt in view Strittmatter teaches **obtains device information to be displayed within the common file dialog object by accessing device information contained in the function discovery database through the programming interface component.**

Both Boldt and Strittmatter fail to teach wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder.

However, Chiloyan teaches wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder to enumerate a list of the installed devices, the hardware and devices folder being different from the created common file dialog object; (see par. 53). (**claim 72; i.e., wherein the function discovery database is also used by a hardware and devices folder to enumerate a list of the connected devices, the hardware and devices folder being different from the created common file dialog object;**) Examiner notes that Applicant admits that the Device Manager is synonymous with the claimed hardware and devices folder (see Response; p. 18 1st full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention as taught by Boldt in view of Strittmatter to include a device manager as taught by Chiloyan to provide the benefit of viewing the properties of all the connected devices.

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **filters the device information using the user-selected filter to obtain a filtered subset of available enumerated devices;** (see Strittmatter; par. 87, par. 92).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **causes the common file dialog object to output display information of the filtered subset of available enumerated devices**

to a display device, the display information comprising the icon of a device in the filtered subset and the corresponding textual description of the device; (see Strittmatter; par. 96-98, Figure 15, Figure 14- teaches icons with textual descriptive titles (e.g. "pda", "BPP Printer", "LAN Printer")).

Strittmatter teaches **receives a user selection of a device;** (see col. 6 lines 20-50).

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **returns a reference to the selected device** (see Strittmatter; par. 37, par. 56-58).

Claim 73:

Boldt in view of Strittmatter teaches **a filtering component and an enumeration component, wherein the enumeration component retrieves all relevant device information in the function discovery database and the filtering component allows an application to select a subset of the device information that is returned by the enumeration component according to the user-selected filter** (see Strittmatter; par. 55-56, par. 80-83, Figure 3; ref. #310, ref. #315).

Claim 74:

Claim 74 is substantially encompassed in claim 72; therefore claim 74 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 72 above.

Claims 75-77:

Claims 75-77 are method claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 51, 53 and 54 respectively; therefore the methods claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 51, 53 and 54 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 43, 48-60 and 62-77 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

2/25/2009
HO

/DOUG HUTTON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176